

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/695,831	10/30/2003	Yasushi Tohi	018765-145	7189	
21839	7590 06/27/2006	•	EXAMINER		
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC			LU, C CAIXIA		
(INCLUDING BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS) POST OFFICE BOX 1404		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
ALEXANDE	RIA, VA 22313-1404	2313-1404	1713		
				DATE MAILED: 06/27/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			th		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<del></del>		
	10/695,831	TOHI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Caixia Lu	1713			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this co D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 M	<u>ay 2006</u> .				
2a)⊠ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)□ This	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E			e merits is		
Disposition of Claims	•				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3 and 5-14</u> is/are pending in the app	olication.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-12 is/are withdrawn	from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3,5,6,13 and 14</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	epted or b) $\square$ objected to by the $\square$	Examiner.	•		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		-			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PT	O-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul><li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign</li><li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li></ul>	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	)-(d) or (f).			
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	• •				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	ed in this National	Stage		
application from the International Bureau  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	, , , ,	nd.			
See the attached detailed Office action for a list	or the certified copies not receive	u.			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal F		D-152)		
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/14/.05	6)				

Application/Control Number: 10/695,831

Art Unit: 1713

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 13, and 14 are under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Alt et al. (US 5,436,305) and Alt et al. (US 5,571,880).

The instant claims are directed to a process for preparing a low molecular weight ethylene polymer with intrinsic viscosity of 0.6 dl/g or less in decaline in the presence of an at least two-atom bridged fluorenyl containing metallocene complex in a temperature range of 100 to 250 °C.

Alt teaches an ethylene polymerization process in the presence of 1,2-difluorenyethane zirconium dichloride catalyst and methylaluminoxane cocatalyst in Example XI of col. 18, wherein the ethylene copolymer Run 9 is a waxy material with intrinsic viscosity (IV) of 0.41, see Table 1. Alt's metallocene catalyst compositions read on the instant claims.

Although Alt's do not disclose the claimed limitation intrinsic viscosity of 0.6 dl/g or less in decaline of the olefin polymers, Alt does expressly disclose that those polymers are low molecular weight and xylene soluble or in waxy state. The lower the molecular weight, the lower the intrinsic viscosity. Therefore, one of the ordinary skill in the art would have expected those low molecular weight olefin polymers to have a correspondingly low intrinsic viscosity in decaline, such as 0.6 dl/g or less in decaline. Even if the claimed intrinsic viscosity of 0.6 dl/g or less in decaline are not inherent in the polymers of the prior art examples, it would still have been obvious to a skilled artisan to lower the intrinsic viscosity of the olefin polymer by introduce more hydrogen

Application/Control Number: 10/695,831 Page 3

Art Unit: 1713

to the polymerization media during the polymerization process. Once a product appearing to be substantially identical is found and a 35 USC 102/103 rejection made, the burden of proof is shifted to the applicant to show an unobvious difference. In re Fitzgerald, 205 USPQ 594. In re Fessmann, 180 USPQ 324. Applicants have not met their burden to demonstrate an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the products of the prior art examples.

Alt further teaches the polymerization can be carried out under a wide range of condition such as those disclosed in US 4,892,851 and US 4,530,914. US 4,530,914 discloses the preferred polymerization temperature in the range of about 50 to 160 °C in lines 1-9 of col. 6. US 4,892,851 discloses in lines 52-65 of col. 3 that the characteristics of the polymer produced can be controlled by varying the polymerization temperature, a higher reaction temperature generally produces a less crystalline polymer with a lower melting point.

Thus, it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan at the time the invention was made to employ Alt's teaching to conducting ethylene polymerization at temperature ranging from 50 to 160 °C, especially at the higher end of the range to obtain a less crystalline ethylene polymer since such is disclosed in the cited reference and in the absence of any showing of criticality and unexpected results.

Similar rejections are made over the teaching of Alt et al. (US 5,571,880), see Example VI, Run 9 in Table I, and Example VII, Run 11 in Table II.

## Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejected claims have been considered.

Applicants argue that the presently claimed process provides a low molecular weight ethylene polymer having a narrow molecular weight distribution and low melting point with higher productivity, and the high polymerization temperature miniaturized the heat removal device and lower the cost. However, polymer structure, molecular weight distribution and productivity are depended on the type of catalyst and polymerization conditions, those characteristics should be inherently in Alt's process because Alt teaches or suggests those process. Further, the high polymerization temperature miniaturized the heat removal device and lower the cost those are expected results rather than unexpected results.

### Conclusion

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Application/Control Number: 10/695,831 Page 5

**Art Unit: 1713** 

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Caixia Lu whose telephone number is (571) 272-1106. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Caixia Lu, Ph. D. Primary Examiner